

## RESPONSE AND REMARKS

### REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nicholls et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,485,369; "Nicholls") in view of Kara (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,568; "Kara").

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER SECTION 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner also stated that Claims 1-21 are rejected under Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Nicholls. However, in the section of the Office Action in which the Examiner rejected the claims under Section 102(b), the Examiner stated that "Nicholls fails to disclose that for each carrier determining whether the carrier would support the shipping of a particular parcel according to rules, and generating a simultaneous display of rates for multiple carriers for a delivery service ..." and then stated that "Kara discloses simultaneously displaying rates for multiple carriers for a selected delivery service and discloses the rates ... for those carriers meeting the desired parameters ...". The Examiner then stated that "[i]t would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Nicholls, to display the rates for multiple carriers, as disclosed by Kara, in order to allow a user to compare rates and choose a carrier themselves ..." (citing Kara, Columns 3-5).

In view of the Examiner's combining Nicholls with Kara to reject the Claims, the Examiner's rejections are all taken as rejections under Section 103(a).

### RESPONSE REGARDING CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 103(a)

The Examiner's rejections of the Claims have been carefully considered. Independent Claims 1- 3, 8-10 and 15-17 have been amended to more distinctly claim the claimed invention. Previously independent Claim 18 has been amended to be dependent on Claim 17.

For the reasons described below, it is respectfully asserted that neither Kara nor Nicholls, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose, anticipate, teach or suggest all of the limitations of Independent Claims 1-3, 8-10, and 15-17.

For example, it is respectfully asserted that neither Kara nor Nicholls, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose, anticipate, teach or suggest the limitation of Independent Claims 1, 5, and 17 for:

... generat[ing] a simultaneous online display of a plurality of delivery services for each carrier of the plurality of carriers that would support shipping of the particular parcel from the respective default shipping location.

In Kara, once a user pre-selects a delivery service, Kara calculates rates for all carriers for the pre-selected delivery service -- that is, Kara discloses a comparison of shipping rates for multiple carriers for a pre-selected service.

As compared to Kara's disclosure of a comparison of shipping rates for multiple carriers for a pre-selected service, the above-recited limitation of independent Claims 1, 8, and 15, as amended, is for "... generat[ing] a simultaneous online display of a plurality of delivery services for each carrier of the plurality of carriers ...".

It is respectfully asserted that various embodiments of the subject matter claimed in, e.g., independent Claims 1, 8, and 15, as amended, would be useful to provide a user with a simultaneous online display of a plurality of delivery services for each carrier of the plurality of carriers that would support shipping of a particular parcel from a respective default shipping location. In comparison to a simultaneous online display of a plurality of delivery services for each carrier, it is respectfully asserted that a user of the system disclosed in Kara would be required to serially select each delivery service and serially obtain Kara's corresponding carrier comparison in order to obtain information about (but which would not be a simultaneous online display) a plurality of delivery services for each carrier of the plurality of carriers. As compared to a user of the system disclosed in Kara having to serially select each delivery service and serially

obtain Kara's corresponding carrier comparisons for each selected delivery service, it is respectfully asserted that various embodiments of the subject matter claimed in Claims 1, 8 and 15, as amended, would be useful to provide a simultaneous online display without the user having to proceed serially through a selection and display process.

For the foregoing reasons, it is therefore respectfully asserted that independent Claims 1, 8, and 15, as amended, are patentable over the cited references.

For reasons similar to those described above with respect to limitations of Claims 1, 8 and 15, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references do not disclose, anticipate, teach or suggest, whether considered alone or in combination, for example, the limitation recited in independent Claims 2, 9, and 16, as amended, for:

... generat[ing] a simultaneous online display comprising an identification of a plurality of delivery services for each carrier of the plurality of carriers that would support shipping of the particular respective parcel from the respective user-specific default shipping location.

It is respectfully asserted that a user of the system disclosed in Kara would be required to serially select each delivery service and serially obtain Kara's carrier comparison in order to obtain a view of a plurality of delivery services for each carrier of the plurality of carriers -- and even after going through the process of serially obtaining Kara carrier comparisons for each pre-selected delivery service, the user would not have a simultaneous online display comprising an identification of a plurality of delivery services for each carrier of the plurality of carriers as would be provided by various embodiments of the subject matter claimed in independent Claims 2, 9, and 16, as amended. Therefore, as compared to a user of the system disclosed in Kara having to serially select each delivery service and serially obtain carrier comparisons for each selected delivery service, it is respectfully asserted that various embodiments of the subject matter claimed in independent Claims 2, 9, and 16, would be useful to provide a simultaneous online display without the user having

to proceed serially through a selection and display process. It is therefore respectfully asserted that independent Claims 2, 9, and 16, as amended, are patentable over the cited references.

For reasons similar to those described above with respect to limitations of Claims 1, 8 and 15, and with respect to independent Claims 2, 9, and 16, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references do not disclose, anticipate, teach or suggest, whether considered alone or in combination, for example, the limitation recited in independent Claims 3, 10, and 17, as amended, for:

... generat[ing] a simultaneous online display identifying a plurality of delivery services for each respective carrier of the plurality of carriers that would support shipping of the particular parcel from the respective default shipping location.

As compared to a user of the system disclosed in Kara having to serially select each delivery service and serially obtain carrier comparisons for each selected delivery service, it is respectfully asserted that various embodiments of the subject matter claimed in independent Claims 3, 10, and 17, as amended, would be useful to provide a simultaneous online display without the user having to proceed serially through a selection and display process. It is therefore respectfully asserted that independent Claims 3, 10, and 17, as amended, are patentable over the cited references.

#### CONCLUSION

For all the foregoing reasons, because the cited references do not disclose, anticipate, teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claims 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16 and 17, as amended, it is therefore respectfully asserted that dependent Claims 4 through 7, 12 through 14, and 18 through 21, are also patentable over the cited reference.

In view of the foregoing reasons and for the reasons previously given, it is respectfully submitted that the invention disclosed and claimed in the Claims, as amended, of the present application is not fairly taught by any of the references of record, taken either alone or in combination, and that the application is in

Application Serial No. 09/684,871

Amendment and Response to Office Action Dated August 1, 2005

condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the present application be reconsidered and allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

KHORSANDI PATENT LAW GROUP, ALC

By Marilyn R. Khorsandi  
Marilyn R. Khorsandi  
Reg. No. 45,744  
626/796-2856